

9 6. 12

A DECLARATION

AGAINST

Anabaptists:

To stop the Prosecution fo their Errours,
falsly pretended to be a Vindication of the Royall
Commission of KING JESUS,
as they call it.

Briefly and fully answering all their Allegations, and clearly
proving the Anabaptisticall Doctrine to be against the glo-
ry of God, the honour of Christ and his Church, against the
Covenant of grace, and against the word of God, and the
priviledges of the Church made over to them by promise;
And also against the Solemne League and Coyenant of the
three Kingdomes.

In Answer to a book, by *Francis Cornwall* presented to the
house of Commons, on *Friday* last, for which he is committed.

*Ephes. 4. 4, 5. There is one Body, one Spirit, even as ye are called in one
hope of your Calling, One Lord, one Faith, one Baptisme.*

*Rom. 16. 17, 18. Now I beseech you brethren, marke them which cause
divisions, and offences, contrary to the doctrine which yee have learned, and
avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus, but their own
belly; and by good words, and faire speeches, deceive the hearts of the simple.*

Octob. 9th

Imprimatur, Ja: Cranford.

London Printed for R. W. 1644.

DECLARATION

AGAINST

ANABAPTISTS:

To stop the Prosecution for their Errors
and to be a Vindication of the Royal
Commission of King James
as they call it

But by and fully answering all their Allegations and clearly
proving the Anabaptist Doctrine to be against the glory
of God, the honour of Christ and his Church, and the
Covenant of grace, and against the word of God, and the
privileges of the Church, and to them by promise
and also against the solemn and Covenant of the
three Kingdoms.



In Answer to a book, by James Coward, directed to the
House of Commons on the 11th of March 1644.

Spoken at the House of Commons, on the 11th of March 1644.
By John Gorton, Esq. one of the Clerks of the House.
Printed by I. Blount, at the Sign of the Gun, in St. Dunstons Church-yard.
1644.

Printed by I. Blount, at the Sign of the Gun, in St. Dunstons Church-yard.
1644.



A DECLARATION

against *Anabaptists*, to stop the prosecution of their errors, falsely pretended to be a vindication of the Royall Commission of KING JESUS, as they call it.

I Shall neither spend much time, nor wast much Paper, in the answering of a Case so plaine: I shall passe by the circumstances, and only gather what you, Master *Francis Cornwall* doth say for your selfe, and answer that breefly and fully.

I. You Argue thus: *That which God hath joyned together no man ought to seperate: But Faith and Baptisme (or more properly dipping) God hath joyned together: Therefore faith and Baptisme (or dipping, as the originall renders it) no man ought to seperate.*

The Major is true Sir, but that helps you nothing, for I shall prove your Minor, and your Argument to be both false.

1. That God hath not inseperably joyned Faith, and Baptisme together is very evident, and there is prooffe enough for it, the Apostles were sent to teach and Baptize all Nations, *Matth. 28. 19.* but many have after fallen away and perished in unbelieve. And on the contrary, many have gone to heaven that were never baptized, for we are all the Children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, *Gal. 3. 26.* And though a man be baptized, yet he that believeth not shall be damned, *Mar. 16. 16.* All Christians are not Saints, and no doubt there are many Saints that were never made Christians.

2. So that now you see this proves no Argument, and moreover were this granted, then by the same Argument none ought to be baptized untill they were able to cast out Devils, and speake with new tongues, for those were the signes which Christ declared should follow them that believe, *Mar. 16. 17.* And if they object and say that the working of miracles are ceased : then may I very well answer, that for mens spirits to discern, and know who are believers, and who not, that is also ceased.

In the next place, you quote the decree of Pope *Innocentius* the third, and the decree of *Gregory*, *Lib. 3. Tit. 42. C. 3.* out of Doctor *Willetts Synopsis*, brought in by him to prove the lawfulness of the baptizing of Infants now, as well as circumcising Infants under the Judaicall Law, which you reprove and call the Doctrine of Antichrist.

But let me tel you doctor *Willet* doth alledge better testimony then that, in the very same place ; namely that children of beleivers are to be baptized. 1. Because they belong unto the Covenant, as it is, *Gen. 17. 7.* I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed. 2. Because they are called holy. *1 Cor. 7. 14.* Again 3. Because they are redeemed by the blood of Christ, who died for all the children of God, *John 11. 52.* And to them belong the Kingdom of God, *Mar. 10. 4.* And 4. Lastly it is proved by the practise of the Apostles, who baptized whole families, with all persons that thereunto belonged, *Act. 16. 33.* and children are of the family, to this is added the testimony of divers learned men, besides the forementioned, as *Augustine*, *Lib. 5. Cont. Pelag. Hypognostic.* *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Orat. 3. in sanct. lavac.* The confession of *Helvetia*, *Seet. 13. pag. 397.* confession of *Bohemia*, *pag. 399.* And in the *Englisb* confession Article 9. *pag. 402.* *No not babes are nor to be restrained (from Baptisme) because they pertaine to the people of God.*

Now for the Covenant in respect of the seales of circumcision, and of Baptisme, you and the rest of your opinions are mistaken in the maine thing of all, for the Covenant which was made to *Abraham*, of which the circumcising of the flesh was an outward Seale : its an everlasting Covenant. *Gen. 17. 13.* and circumcision being taken away, because Christ is come himself (the grace of God being the inward seale, as *Calvin* saith) and baptisme a perpetuall supply thereof : *Christom*, *hom. 39. in Gen.*

But in regard of the Protestation you have taken, you say you oppose the baptizing of infants; and your first reason is, *because there was a precept from God to enioyne circumcision.* *Gen 17. 11.* and an example, *Gen. 24. 4.* But neither precept nor example in Scripture, for baptizing of Infants.

To answer this in the first place, I will give you a precept out of the Scripture where all both young and old are to bee baptized, and that is

Act.

Act. 2. 38, 39. Be baptized every one of you (saith Peter there) and let it be done in the name of Iesus Christ, old and young, all were to be baptized, and if they did repent and were baptized, then (saith he) they shall receive the gift of the holy Ghost, and to encourage them (and in them us also) to baptize infants; he tells them, the promise is unto you, and to your children; yea, and to the children of those that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call: And for that which you speake of dipping, or sprinkling it much matters not, so there be the external element, which is water, Acts 10. 47. And there is likewise an example, Acts 2. In the infancy of the Church, there were added to the Church in one day three thousand souls, which received the outward Seale of Baptisme, ver. 41. and all that believed were together, and had all things common, ver. 44. which was after that the Apostle had declared to them, that the promise was to them, and their children, ver. 39. and therefore we must needs thinke that the children pertooke of the same priviledges with them.

Your second reason is because that there was a prefixt day for circumcision, to wit the eight, Gen. 17. 12. but no day appointed when it shall be dipped (or sprinkled.)

To which I answer; That the place you mention, Gen. 17. 12. is a command, that every son of eight dayes old shall be circumcised, not that the command is absolute for the eight day: For all the people that were borne in the wildernesse, by the way as they came forth out of Egypt, them they had not circumcised, untill afterwards, Josh. 5. 5. when necessity urged Circumcision must be deferred, as the eating of the Passeover might bee put off, Numb. 9. 10.

But thirdly, you say, That there was a penalty imposed on the uncircumcised man-childe, Gen. 17. 14. but not on those that are not baptized, because Election, and not Baptisme, saveth the infant, Rom. 9. 11. 12.

To which I answer; That for the eight day there spoken of, it is used onely in the Septuagint, it is not in the Hebrew: and for the rest, the words are, *Qui non circumciderit*, he which shall not circumcise, &c. So reades the Originall, the Calde Paraphrast, *Junius*, &c. which sheweth, that it must be understood of them that are *adulti*, of yeares of discretion, not of infants. And for the punishment, What is it? Some take it for corporall death, some for the extraordinary shortening of their dayes, some for excommunication; and lastly, others take it for the cutting off from the society of Gods people now, and the fellowship of the Saints hereafter, for contemning Gods Ordinance of Circumcision: And thus the Fathers of the Hebrews, having exhorted them to faith and a good conscience, and to be baptized, Heb. 12. 22. he told them, that if he that despised Moses Law, died without mercy— of how much sorer punishment

ment shall be then be thought worthy of, who contemning the Ordinance of God, whether Baptisme, or other, hath troden under foot the Son of God, and counted the blood of the Covenant an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto the Spirit of Grace? I would have you that contemne Baptisme to consider this well: And as for infants, if they be not baptized, (as formerly those that were not circumcised) it is the parents fault for omitting it, not the infants, except the childe be come to discretion, as may appeare in the example of *Moses*, whom the Lord punished, and not the childe, for the neglecting of the Sacrament, *Exod. 4. 24.*

II. To proceed: You argue thus: *That which is not of faith is a sin to the Church that doth it. But the baptizing of the infants of beleevers (as it is used) is not of faith. Ergo a sin.*

Now the Clause which you bring in (*as it is now used*) you might have told us what circumstances you meane: I doubt not, but something will appeare superstitious in it, as the Crosse in Baptisme, which is now almost left; and some other Ceremonies may be excepted against; so that I shall onely prove the baptizing of beleevers children to be of faith, in answer to this Argument; as may appear by that in the 19. of the *Act.* where *Paul* tells the Disciples which he found at Ephesus, *That John Baptized, saying to the people, that they should beleeve on him that should come after him, that is on Christ Jesus, Acts 19. 4.* This was a command which he gave to them; and when they were baptized, they were very ignorant, for they had not learned to know whether there were an holy Ghost or not, *vers. 2.* though afterwards *Paul* laid his hands on them, to declare, that they were baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and they received the holy Ghost, *vers. 6.* And the children of beleeving parents are cleane by being so; and being of the holy seed, *1 Cor. 7. 14.* have right to (Baptisme) the Ordinance of God thereby, *Acts 16. 33.*

But to answer your Reasons, as you call them, which are very unreasonable ones, wherein I will be very brieve.

1. You say, *That Baptisme of infants of beleevers, puts them into a state of grace, and remission of sins before calling*, when as your owne testimony is against you, and proves that Baptisme hath no such prerogative, for it is the Election of Gods owne purpose and grace before the world began, that puts us into a state of Grace, which is manifested unto, and conferred upon some before Baptisme, *Act. 8. 36, 37.* and upon others after Baptisme, *Act. 19. 4.* Baptisme being the onely outward seal of the Church, and the Grace of Gods Spirit the inward seal, as is before proved.

2. That it constitutes them visible members of the Congregation, is true, and those places alledged, *1 Pet. 2. 9. Rom. 1. 6, 7.* and *1 Cor. 1. 2.* do not keep out the unbeleeving husbands of beleeving wives, nor the unbeleeving

leaving wives of believing husbands, nor their children from the Sacraments; for if they did, those children would be unclean indeed; but now are they holy, *1 Cor. 7. 14.*

3. 4. Your third Reason is answered in the first, because Baptisme is but the outward seale; and your fourth Reason is very absurd: for I for my part doubt not, but there will be care taken for the liberty of tender consciences, so far as Gods word will beare and assist; that to be without order, is against *Pauls* rule; and where the powers ordained by God, appoint orders according to Gods word, I am sure that *Paul* saith, to resist such power, is to resist the Ordinance of God, *Rom. 13. 1, 2.*

5. Your next Reason is answered by what hath been said already: Namely, that the Covenant of grace is the inward seale of Gods Elect, Baptisme the outward seale of the visible Church, whose members are not all elected, nor shall all be saved; for many fall away, and make a mock of Christ, *Heb. 6. 6.* But those who have the inward seale, that are baptized into Christ, whether Jew or Gentile, bond or free, they are heires of heaven, according to the promise, *Gal. 3. 27, 28, 29.*

6. 7. 8. For your next Reason, it doth not at all follow; for none is so unwise to think that grace is entailed to generation, but regeneration; neither doth it follow that all that are baptized are saved, the contrary being already proved. And God is able as well to give to infants an habit of faith, so far as to make them capable of ascending to heaven if they die, as well as men and women: Therefore Christ tells us, that *to such belong the Kingdome of God, Mat. 19. 14.*

9. 10. Your former Reasons proving thus false; you see your discovery is nothing, but I have discovered your folly in these pretences: I have also proved that baptizing of infants is not against the Commission of Christ, and how members of the Church, as disciples in Baptisme, I shal shew by and by.

11. 12. 13. 14. Your next reason is all one with the sixt, and your twelfth with the tenth, so that I passe to your thirteenth reason, where you falsly draw these conclusions: either first, that all baptized persons are saved, or Secondly, that some being in the state of grace, may fall away afterwards, neither of which follow, because baptisme doth not conferre grace, as is already proved, which is your fourteenth conclusion.

15. That you say baptizing of infants opposeth the Kingly, and prophetical office of Christ in faith and order, and to prove that, you alledge, *Matth. 16. 15.* to make good that you say, that Christ requireth that every person that is baptized be a beleever: I answer, it is true Christ requires it, and before God the unbelievers have no right to those Ordinances, nor is it effectuell to them whilest they are so, yet because men cannot distinguish

guish believers from unbelievers, therefore as *MattheW* hath it, *Mat. 28. 19.* *Jelus* sent his Apostles, and bade them, *go ye* (saith he) *and teach all nations*, or as you quoting the place, render *disciple the nations*, or *make disciples*; and how must that be done? baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghost: well, and when they are made, what must be done then? teach them, &c. here is no opposition of this order you see.

III. In the next place you Argue thus: *That consequence which is upheld by the traditions of men, is destructive to the Nationall Covenant of England, and Scotland, raised by an Ordinance of Parliament. But baptizing of Infants is so held, Ergo destructive to the Nationall Covenant.*

As you have abused the Scripture to your one interpretation contrary to all judicious men; so do you go about to abuse the Covenant of the three Kingdoms: first, the Covenant bindes to joyne with the Scots in the baptizing of infants, which you would not have done: 2. It bindes to joyne in reforming what is amisse in the manner of baptizing, you would take the Ordinance quite away: 3. It bindes to extirpate Schisme, and whatsoever is contrary to sound doctrine, which you would bring in: 4. You are bound to preserve the liberties of the Kingdom; you would have the holy seed cast out and loose those priviledges, which Christ hath purchased for them. 5. You are bound to discover such as are ill instruments, by hindring the reformation of Religion, or making faction, and to bring them to publique tryall to receive condigne punishment, and you your self are such a one: 6. You are bound in your calling to labour for the peace of the Kingdom, and you go about to disturb it, and give occasion to honest men, that desire some liberty of conscience in lawfull things to be worse thought on for you, and so whereas you should be a help to them, you are an hurt and a scandall: and therefore examine your self well, and try your self by the Scripture, and by the Covenant, and Con it over, and over again, till you know what it is to make such a Covenant in the presence of Almighty God the searcher of all hearts, protesting that you did it with a true intention to performe the same, as you shal answer at that great day, when the secrets of all hearts shall bee disclosed; oh how dangerous a thing it is to make a seame, and a rent in the Church of Christ, when the worke is a doing by such wise master builders, and pray to God again, and again, most humbly beseeching the Lord to strengthen us by his holy spirit to do all things to his glorie, and to blesse their desires, and proceedings with such successe as may be deliverance and safety to his people, and encouragement to other Christian Churches, groaning under, or in danger of the yoke of Antichristian Tyranny, to joyne in the same, or like Association and Covenant, to the glory of God, the enlargement of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, and the peace and tranquility of Christian Kingdoms, and Commonwealths.

FINIS.

A N

10

ORDINANCE

OF THE

Lords and Commons

Assembled in

PARLIAMENT,

For the maintaining of the Forces of
the seven associated Counties un-
der the Command of E D W A R D
Earl of MANCHESTER.

*By a Weekly payment upon the said associated Coun-
ties; to begin the first day of September, and
to continue for foure Moneths next
ensuing.*

Ordered by the Commons in Parliament, That
this Ordinance be forthwith printed & published.
H. Elsynge, Cler. Parl. D. Com.

LONDON: Printed for Edward Husbonds.
October 10. 1644.